

Nathan R. Zeltzer, Esq., NV SBN 5173  
LAW OFFICE OF NATHAN R. ZELTZER  
333 Marsh Avenue, Suite 1A  
Reno, Nevada 89509  
[nrzbk@yahoo.com](mailto:nrzbk@yahoo.com)  
(775) 324-7600

E-FILED ON: 3/8/10

Attorney for Debtor

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

IN RE:

DANNY R. FIDENES,  
MARIA LINDA FIDENES,

Debtor(s).

) Case No.: 09-54448-GWZ

) Chapter 13

) **OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR**  
) **RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY**

) HEARING DATE: April 9, 2010

) HEARING TIME: 1:30 p.m.

COMES NOW, the debtors DANNY R. FIDENES and MARIA LINDA FIDENES, by  
and through her attorney, Nathan R. Zeltzer, Esq. and opposes WELLS FARGO BANK's,  
(hereinafter "Movant") Motion for Relief From the Automatic Stay.

This opposition is brought pursuant to the Points and Authorities included herein, and on  
further oral argument of counsel as may be presented at the time of the hearing.

/s/Nathan R. Zeltzer,  
Nathan R. Zeltzer  
Attorney for Debtors

1       **I.           FACTS**

2           The debtors filed their Chapter 13 bankruptcy on December 15, 2010. The filing of the  
3 bankruptcy was to stop collections action by their second lien holder on their home and reduce the  
4 outstanding obligations on their home by filing a Motion to Value Collateral on this property. The  
5 Plan has been confirmed and is pending confirmation.

6           This is the debtors family home where they reside. The debtor estimated that the house  
7 was worth approximately \$239,000.00 as listed on their schedule A. The approximate amount of the  
8 loans against the property total \$216,000.00.

9       **II. LAW AND ARGUMENT**

10          To obtain relief under 11 USC §362(d)(1) the court can grant relief for “cause”. In this  
11 case the Movant has not met this burden.

12          To obtain relief under 11 USC §362(d)(2) a creditor must make a **prim facie** (emphasis  
13 added) case that (1) the property over-encumbered, and (2) it is not necessary for an effective  
14 reorganization, see In re Elmore, 94 B.R. 670 (Bkrtcy C.D. Cal. 1988).

15          A debtor’s principal residence in a Ch. 13 case is virtually always necessary to an  
16 effective reorganization... if the home is not saved, the reorganization is not effective, Elmore at 673.

17          Debtors initiated a Mortgage Loan Modification review with the Movant at or around the  
18 time they filed their bankruptcy. Debtors were notified by the Movant’s representatives that if her  
19 loan was current she could not apply to have a modification processed. Thus, she stopped making  
20 payments to be able to try a modification of her 1<sup>st</sup> mortgage loan. Under the Home Affordable  
21 Modification Program (hereafter HAMP) the Movant cannot terminate a Modification review due to  
22 a bankruptcy filing. In this case the Movant is attempting to seek relief from Stay, without honoring  
23 the terms of HAMP which they are a party to. Debtors’ should be able to complete their  
24 Modification process to determine if they qualify for a Modification under the terms of HAMP. The  
25 debtors intend to keep their home, which is one of the reasons for filing bankruptcy.

26       \\

27       \\

1 WHEREFORE, for the reasons aforementioned, the debtor asks that the Motion be  
2 denied. In the alternative, if the Motion is not denied it is requested that the debtors be granted an  
3 Adequate Protection Order to cure the two post-petition missed mortgage payments on their home. It  
4 is further requested that the Movant allow the Debtors' to complete the HAMP modification request  
5 that has been submitted to the Movant. Additionally, the debtors request any further relief that the  
6 Court deems just and equitable.

7  
8 Submitted this 8 day March of, 2010

9  
10 /s/Nathan R. Zeltzer  
11 Nathan R. Zeltzer, Esq.  
12 Attorney for the Debtor  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28